



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,180	07/25/2003	Aaron Stephen Meyers	310478.01	3854
22971 7590 02/02/2010 MICROSOFT CORPORATION ONE MICROSOFT WAY REDMOND, WA 98052-6399				
EXAMINER BARRON JR, GILBERTO				
ART UNIT 2432		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 02/02/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

roks@microsoft.com
ntovar@microsoft.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/627,180

Applicant(s)

MEYERS ET AL.

Examiner

Gilberto Barron Jr.

Art Unit

2432

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-25 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13-20, 22, 24 and 25 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 6, 8, 10, 12, 23 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.
3. The structure of the various "means for" elements is not described. Each of the listed means elements must be described in terms of what algorithm is intended. The disclosure only provides "black boxes" as the structures. See Figure 10A

"means for defining a relational abstraction of a data store"; "means for selecting one view as a base view of the report"; "means for creating at least one report field using the views, fields and relations associated with the base view"; and "means to create the report field by providing means for: a) specifying", b)"creating; (i), (ii), c) creating (i), (ii)".

For a computer-implemented means-plus-function claim limitation that invokes 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, the corresponding structure is required to be more than simply a general purpose computer or microprocessor. The corresponding structure for

a computer-implemented function must include the algorithm as well as the general purpose computer or microprocessor.

Claim elements "means for defining a relational abstraction of a data store"; "means for selecting one view as a base view of the report"; "means for creating at least one report field using the views, fields and relations associated with the base view"; and "means to create the report field by providing means for: a) specifying", b)"creating; (i), (ii), c) creating (i), (ii)" are means (or step) plus function limitation that invokes 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. However, the written description fails to disclose the corresponding structure, material, or acts for the claimed function: "defining a relational abstraction of a data store; "selecting one view as a base view of the report"; "creating at least one report field using the views, fields and relations associated with the base view"; and "create the report field by providing means for: a) specifying", b)"creating; (i), (ii), c) creating (i), (ii)".

Applicant is required to:

- (a) Amend the claim so that the claim limitation will no longer be a means (or step) plus function limitation under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph; or
- (b) Amend the written description of the specification such that it expressly recites what structure, material, or acts perform the claimed function without introducing any new matter (35 U.S.C. 132(a)).

If applicant is of the opinion that the written description of the specification already implicitly or inherently discloses the corresponding structure, material, or acts so that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize what structure, material, or acts perform the claimed function, applicant is required to clarify the record by either:

- (a) Amending the written description of the specification such that it expressly recites the corresponding structure, material, or acts for performing the claimed

function and clearly links or associates the structure, material, or acts to the claimed function, without introducing any new matter (35 U.S.C. 132(a)); or

(b) Stating on the record what the corresponding structure, material, or acts, which are implicitly or inherently set forth in the written description of the specification, perform the claimed function. For more information, see 37 CFR 1.75(d) and MPEP §§ 608.01(o) and 2181.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 3, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by publication entitled "A Interactive Database End User Facility For The Definition and Manipulation Of Forms by A.H.F. Laender et al. {of record, see prior PTO-892}

Claim 3 limitation of "defining a relational abstraction of a data store, the definition including a plurality of views, fields associated with the views, and any relations between the views selecting one of the views as a base view of a report" is met in Figure 1 and Section 2.1 --The hierarchally related dataitems--.

Claim 3 limitation of "creating at least one report field using the views, fields and relations associated with the base view" is met by Figure 2 and Section 2.2 --The view definition or --View Builder--.

Claim 3 limitation " wherein information returned in a report is limited by specifying a filter that limits any rows returned in the report" is met in Figure 3.2 --Usage Session-- as per the filters using logical operators --Enter Selection Condition"--.

Claim 6 limitation "creating a plurality of fields for use as filter fields" and "specifying at least one logical filter operator" is met in Figure 3.2 --Usage Session-- as per the filters using logical operators --Enter Selection Condition"-- as each field can be filtered, see NAME and YEAR.

Claim 8 is met by Section 2.1, "Intuitively, a form can be thought of as a file with records containing nested repeating groups, each record corresponding to a form occurrence (Luo & Yao 1981). "

Claim 10 is met by the display commends in Section 3.2.

Claim 12 is met by the display commends in Section 3.2.

Claim 23 is met by the display commends in Section 3.2.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13-21, 22, and 24-25 are allowed.
7. Claim 21 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Gilberto Barron Jr. at telephone number (571)272-3799.

/Gilberto Barron Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2432